DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 957 EA 022 448

AUTHOR Shelton, Maria M.; Brown, Alan R.
TITLE Mentoring Junior Educational Administration Faculty: A Comparison Study between the United States and Canada.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented by Bettye J. Poole at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Council for Educational Administration (Atlanta, GA, November 11-13, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Comparative Analysis; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Mentors; Schools of Education; *Sex Differences; Surveys; *Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS *Canada; *United States

ABSTRACT

A fall 1989 study measured the extent to which American educational administration junior faculty were mentored and explored mentoring differences between female and male survey respondents. The study was replicated in winter 1990, when Canadian educational administration professors were queried. The American study systematically surveyed 236 out of 600 professors belonging to the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, for a 72 percent response rate. The Canadian study sampled 138 professors out of 239 belonging to the Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration, for a 76 percent response rate. Results were congruent with literature review findings; 64 percent of Canadian respondents and 68 percent of American respondents lacked mentors. There was gender congruence in the two countries; 80 percent of Canadian respondents were male, compared with 83 percent of American respondents. However, 57 percent of Canadian female respondents had mentors, whereas only 31 percent of Canadian males did. Also, 67 percent of Canadian females with mentors agreed that the mentor was very helpful, compared with 38 percent of Canadian males. (American data were not available for many gender comparisons.) Advantages and disadvantages of mentoring were briefly summarized. The two studies confirmed literature findings that mentoring seldom occurred for junior educational administration professors. Both American and Canadian respondents expressed support for such an effort. (213 references) (MLH)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED325957

# "MENTORING JUNIOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION FACULTY: A COMPARISON STUDY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA"

MARIA M. SHELTON, ED.D.
CHAIR, ADMINISTRATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL
LEADERSHIP DEPARTMENT
UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA
TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

ALAN R. BROWN, DIRECTOR
49TH PARALLEL EDUCATIONAL CONSULTANTS
NORTH VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration, Atlanta, Georgia, November 11-13, 1990.

PRESENTED BY:

BETTYE J. POOLE

DOCTORAL STUDENT, UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA

EA 022 448

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Shelton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

"Mentoring Junior Educational Administration Faculty:

A Comparison Study Between

the United States and Canada"

## Introduction

As Oscar Wilde (1892) stated: "Experience is the name everyone gives to their mistakes." It is for this reason that apprenticeship became a common training phenomena in America's early years. The practice persisted, in part, because it provided neophyte tradespersons the opportunity to adjust to the inherent change taking place around them while still avoiding major pitfalls due to inexperience.

## Statement of Need

Even though apprenticeships and tutelage were appreciated in the trades, the same cannot be said of academia. Only during the last two decades has the practice been employed in universities and colleges. A Fall 1989 study measured the extent to which American educational administration junior faculty were mentored. The study was replicated in Winter 1990 when Canadian educational administration professors were queried.

## Definitions

Following an extensive literature review the authors employed the

following definitions:

**JUNIOR FACULTY:** A first year professor who normally holds the rank of assistant professor.

**MENTORING:** A process whereby veteran faculty members professionally assist, encourage and guide junior faculty persons.

**MENTOR:** A veteran faculty person or administrator who counsels and guides junior faculty persons.

**PROTEGE:** A junior faculty person.

**NCPEA:** National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (for American Professors).

**CASEA:** Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration

## Purpose

The following research questions directed the American and Canadian studies.

1) To what extent were educational administration professors mentored as junior faculty persons?

2) To what extent, if any, were there mentoring differences between female and male respondents?

3) To what extent did advantages and disadvantages exist in

mentoring?

## METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

A descriptive research design was used in examining the extent to which educational administration professors had been mentored as junior faculty. The completed surveys were taken to Central Michigan University Computer Services Department where Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS-X) software was used to analyze data.

Descriptive statistics (means and percentages) were used to make comparisons and to show discrepancies.

### Population

The American study systematically surveyed 236, out of a population of 600, educational administration professors who were members of National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA). The initial mailout was sent September 1989, and yielded a 60% (142) response rate. A follow-up mailout in October 1989, produced a 72% (170) response rate. No further survey distribution was necessary because of the statistically acceptable percent.

The Canadian study sampled 138 professors, out of a population of 239, members of the Canadian Association for the Study of Educational

Administration (CASEA). The initial mailout (January, 1990) yielded 105 usable surveys for a (76%) response rate; therefore, no follow-up was conducted.

## Instrument

The American survey contained 25 items that were based on the following key literature findings:

1) Mentoring was seldom available for junior faculty;
2) When there was mentoring for junior faculty, it was an unorganized effort; and
3) If organized mentoring programs were established in colleges and universities, junior faculty would likely benefit.

Of the 25 items, 11 were forced choice; eight were Likert-type; and four were open-ended.

Before the study was replicated in Canada, the authors made several revisions and additions to the original survey. Four items were added, and wording was changed on several others to improve clarity and conciseness. The Canadian survey had 29 items: 14 forced choice, 11 Likert-type, and four open-ended.

To achieve content validity, the original survey was piloted on six educational administration professors and 10 educational administration graduate students. Based on professors' and students' input, the survey was revised.

Reliability estimates were not reported because survey items were independent of one another.

## Procedures

The following procedures were used in the American study:

1) The National Council of Professors of Education Administration was contacted for mailing labels. Over 600 such labels were secured; from that number, 236 American NCPEA members were selected as the sample. Each of the 236 respondents received a survey that had an identification number, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. As surveys were returned to the author, identifying numbers were checked off. When the second mailout was sent, only individuals who had not responded to the initial mailing were sent another survey.

2) Usable surveys were then taken to the Central Michigan University Computer Services Center where data were analyzed using SPSS-X software. Several weeks later analyzed data were returned to the author.

3) In December 1989, and early 1990, the two authors determined to replicate the study in Canada. At that point, mailing labels were secured from the Canadian Society for the Study of Education (CSSE). The mailout was completed by January 5, 1990, and by early February, a 76% response rate was achieved. No subsequent mailout was conducted.

4) Canadian surveys were also taken to Central Michigan University Computer Services where data were analyzed using SPSS-X software. Data results were returned to the authors.

5) A paper that described and delineated the conjoint research findings was delivered at NCPEA Conference in August 1990.

## Limitations

The following limitations apply to the two studies:

1) There were slight variations between the American and Canadian surveys which meant that in several instances data were not available for comparison.

2) All NCPEA members were education or educational administration professors while some CASEA members were business administration or public administration professors. Had both samples been comprised of education or educational administration professors, responses might have been more similar.

3) On the survey, Likert-type items were utilized. Respondents were allowed to mark unsure as a response. Because weight was given to the unsure response, means and standard deviations might have been affected.

4) No attempt was made to offer a prototype model for mentoring. Subsequent studies would do well to address this dimension.

## Quantitative Findings

Tables 1 through 10 reflect demographic characteristics of respondents and mentors in terms of the following: faculty rank, time at present institution, highest earned degree, gender and chronological age. Mentor demographic data are enclosed in parenthesis ( ). Because of slight variations in the American survey and Canadian survey, American mentor data are not always provided. Percentages are rounded and therefore do not necessarily total 100%.

Table One gives Respondent and Mentor Faculty Rank.

Table One
Faculty Rank
Respondent and Mentor

| | Asst. Prof. | Assoc. Prof. | Full Prof. | Other Admin. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| American | 11% (3%) | 36% (23%) | 49% (72%) | 5% (2%) |
| Canadian | 19% (7%) | 30% (29%) | 45% (61%) | 6% (3%) |

Forty-nine percent of American respondents were full professors while fewer (45%) Canadian respondents were full professors. The next most common rank was associate (36%, 30%) American, Canadian respectively.

One would expect there to be more mentors who held the rank of full professor, rather than associate or assistant, which was true in both the United States and Canada. An overwhelming percent (72%) of American mentors were full professors; nearly half (49%) of Canadian mentors were full professors. Clearly, full professors constitute the bulk of mentor ranks.

Table Two shows the number of years that respondents had been at their present institution.

Table Two
Number of Years At Present Institution

| | 0-3 years | 4-7 years | 8+ years |
|---|---|---|---|
| American | 22% | 19% | 59% |
| Canadian | 27% | 19% | 55% |

Surprisingly, both American and Canadian respondents had been at their present institutions a relatively long period of time: 8+ years (59%, 55%) respectively. The next most prevalent length of time

was 3 years (22% of Americans and 27% of Canadian respondents). It appears that institutions have a healthy mix of newcomers and veteran professors.

Table Three presents highest held degree of respondents.

Table Three
Highest Earned Degree
of Respondents

| | Bachelor's | Master's | Specialists | Doctorate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| American | 0% | 0% | 1% | 99% |
| Canadian | 0% | 4% | 1% | 95% |

Slightly more Americans (99%) held terminal degrees than Canadian respondents (95%).

Table Four shows gender breakdown of respondents.

Table Four
Respondent Gender

| | Female | Male |
|---|---|---|
| American | 17% | 83% |
| Canadian | 20% | 80% |

In both countries, male respondents greatly outnumbered female respondents in professorial ranks: 83% American and 80% Canadian.

Table Five illustrates respondent and mentor chronological age.

Table Five
Respondents' and Mentors' Chronological Age

| | 29 yrs. or younger | 30-39 yrs. | 40-49 yrs. | 50-59 yrs. | 60 or older |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| American | 0%* | 9% * | 24%* | 41% * | 26% * |
| Canadian | 0% | 9% (3%) | 43% (35%) | 38% (53%) | 10% (10%) |

* Data unavailable for American mentors.

No American or Canadian respondents were 29 years or younger which may be partially explained by the fact that an educational administration professor usually holds a terminal degree and has teaching and administrative experience, each of which requires time. Eighty-one percent of Canadians fell within the 40-59 year old range while 65% of Americans were between 40-59 years of age. Twenty-six percent of American respondents were 60 or over; only 10% of Canadians were in that age bracket. The fewest number of respondents (both American and Canadian) fell in the 30-39 age range. Most Canadian mentors (88%) were between 40-59 years of age.

Table Six gives the breakdown of respondents who, as assistant professors, had mentors.

Table Six
Respondents Who Had Mentors

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| American | 32% | 68% |
| Canadian | 37% | 64% |

For both groups of respondents, mentoring was seldom available. Results were very similar, as reflected by the low percent of mentors, in both countries (32%, 37%).

An additional item on the Canadian survey asked if respondents had more than one mentor; 80% had only one mentor.

Another item on the Canadian survey asked respondents if a mentor would have been helpful. Sixty-nine percent agreed that having a mentor would have been very beneficial.

Still another Canadian survey item asked respondents to identify the mentor's academic department. Forty-four percent of Canadian mentors were in educational administration, while 44% were in general education. Some 12% of mentors were in other academic departments.

Table Seven gives gender of mentors.

Table Seven
Mentors' Gender

| | Female | Male |
|---|---|---|
| American | 8% | 92% |
| Canadian | 15% | 85% |

More Canadian mentors (15%) were of the female gender than was true of American mentors (8%). Even though this was the case, the overwhelming majority of mentors in both countries were male.

Table Eight provides insight on the length of time mentors helped junior faculty.

Table Eight
Length of Time Mentor Helped Junior Faculty Person

| | Less than year | One year | Over a year |
|---|---|---|---|
| American | 14% | 12% | 74% |
| Canadian | 13% | 10% | 77% |

In both countries, mentoring proved to be a lengthy commitment in terms of years: over a year (74% American) and (77% Canada).

Another survey item on the Canadian study asked respondents if they were presently mentoring; 74% indicated that they were not.

Table Nine depicts respondents' willingness to mentor others.

Table Nine
Willingness to Mentor

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| American | 98% | 2% |
| Canadian | 89% | 11% |

Most Americans (98%) and Canadians (89%) were amenable to mentoring junior faculty. There were, however, 11% of Canadians who said that they were not agreeable to mentoring others.

The next series of survey items were Likert-type where the number reflected extent of agreement: (5) strongly disagree, (4) disagree, (3) unsure, (2) agree, and (1) strongly agree. The lower the mean, the stronger respondent agreement.

Table Ten gives means, by rank order, for American and Canadian respondents. A 1.0 response indicates strongest agreement while a 5.0 indicates strongest disagreement.

Table Ten
Means by Rank Order of Likert-
Type Items for American and Canadian Respondents

| American - | Canadian - | Survey Item |
|---|---|---|
| - | 1.8 | Formal mentoring would help. |
| 2.4 | 2.2 | Mentor very helpful to me as assistant professor. |
| - | 2.2 | Formal mentor training would help mentors. |
| - | 2.4 | Junior faculty persons need more than one mentor. |
| 2.4 | 2.4 | Mentor helped me understand higher education governance and politics. |
| 2.5 | 2.5 | Mentor was close friend. |
| 2.8 | 2.6 | Mentor gave me feedback. |
| 3.0 | 2.8 | It was pure chance that I found a mentor. |
| 3.1 | 3.0 | Mentor assisted with professional organizations. |
| 3.4 | 3.0 | Mentor taught me in's and out's of publishing. |
| 4.2 | 4.1 | Mentor received formal training prior to mentoring. |

The item that drew the strongest Canadian agreement ($\bar{X}$=1.8) and was the most important finding was, "formal mentoring would help." Those

respondents who had mentors indicated that mentors were very helpful. They also believed that formal mentor training would be very positive, ($\bar{X}$=2.2). By contrast, the items that drew the strongest American agreement ($\bar{X}$=2.4) were: "mentor was very helpful as an assistant professor," and "mentor helped me understand higher education governance and politics." American respondents failed to express as strong agreement for mentoring as their Canadian counterparts.

The item receiving the strongest disagreement by both American ($\bar{X}$=4.2) and Canadian ($\bar{X}$=4.1) respondents was, "mentor received formal training prior to mentoring," which points to the fact that higher education institutions are not conducting formal training programs for mentors.

## Qualitative Findings

Faculty response to four open-ended items was often extensive, and reflected both thoughts and feelings, and was of considerable interest.

The first open-ended item asked respondents to complete the following phrase:

To Me, Mentoring. . . .

## American

Shouldn't be a molding experience. I want support and guidance, but I do not want to be told that this is what you need to do.

Can be very helpful, but the new assistant professor must have the "right stuff" for success.

Is discussing alternatives . . . knowing I'll decide.

Should be an organized program with training for mentors.

Helps a new person learn the ropes.

Is a professional responsibility.

Is very important to new professor. It can help <u>him</u> develop knowledge and teaching effectiveness. Understand institutional expectations . . .

## Canadian

Is a special and valuable relationship, and responsibility of established faculty. Guiding, supporting, even pushing on occasion, but most importantly, sharing. It is reciprocal relationship, although the balance changes over time.

Unique, if not inspirational, guidance by one who is experienced and knowledgeable. Should profoundly shape, not the direction of future activities, but the way another thinks about the world.

Is the process of guiding a novice practitioner through a confusing socialization period.

Assists a less experienced person with socialization process in a new situation.

Includes socialization into the group, pastoral care and probably sponsorship.

Helps you learn the ropes, gives you support.

Being a role model; enlarging aspirations grounded in the principles of good teaching, effective conversation, and powerful modeling.

Is the richest (riskiest) form of teaching.

Overcomes the vulnerability of the junior professor.

Is essential to reaching one's full potential for early career progress.

Is a new fad.

"It is informal;" it cannot be willed. If "legislated," it is merely advisement.

Encouragement, assistance and goal setting.

Was the only thing that helped me to survive,

Made the difference in terms of settling into my professional position.

These comments reflect that mentoring means different things to different people. Diverse perceptions and understandings of mentoring leads to divergent expectations and problems between mentor and protege. To avoid problems, mentoring should be based on a clear agreement (ie: definitions, expectations, intent/extent/(parameters) time/constraints) prior to entering into a mentoring relationship.

Several other points emerge from the comments:

1) Proteges who have mentors must still assume responsibility for self-growth; and 2) Mentoring is very helpful for junior faculty persons.

The next open ended item was:

The Main Problem My Mentor and I Had Was. . . .

**America**

None. We worked as a team from the beginning.

One of being too informal.

That his role was as my competitor.

Not enough time together.

She told me what to do.

A couple of them died. None among the living.

Could have used help in publishing.

He was too busy to see me.

**Canadian**

Dealing with my rush to write, publish and present at conferences.

Time.

Not a formal association.

No clear notion of his role as mentor.

That I was not seen as having any opinions of my own. I sometimes felt that I was not given credit for my own work, but seen as an adjunct of my mentor.

Lack of commitment of mentor.

He didn't know how to help with publishing.

He was jealous of some of my accomplishments.

Time for him to observe me as I taught.

Her attitude of superiority.

As I went/grew beyond him, ideas RE: (mentor-mentee) changed.

Changing the relationship as I developed professionally.

Everyone assumed I knew the in's and out's of daily routine. As a result, I am still doing things the hard way because I am uncertain or ignorant about services that are available to me.

My immaturity. Unwillingness on my part, to accept authority; experience. too proud, afraid and stupid, to ask for help or to listen carefully. Would not admit my shortcomings.

To summarize, mentoring, like all endeavors, is not without its problems. Mentors and proteges must work together.

The third open-ended item was:

Today, my Mentor and I. . . .

| American | Canadian |
|---|---|
| Are good friends. | Are good friends. |
| Have a strong personal and professional relationship. | He was the major key in my learning very quickly to be a good professor. Mind you, I had a good base within myself, but he is still my model in many ways. |
| I've changed mentors, as I have jobs. | |
| Plot, scheme, critique, laugh. | |
| and I Are friends . . . but, I would not choose him as a companion in a foxhole my last night on earth. | |
| Friends over more than 25 years. | Enjoy a continuing friendship. I still bounce career ideas off him. |
| No longer meet. | Communicate occasionally. |
| | Meet on an ad hoc, social basis but little mentoring. |
| | No longer are associated. |

Monthly phone calls to mentor, 15 years after completing degree under mentor.

Passed away but not forgotten.

These respondent comments reflect the friendship that often results from the mentoring relationship.

The fourth and final open-ended item was:

For Mentoring To Work, What Must Occur?

**American**

Mutual respect.

A good match.

Formal program.

Trust, interest.
Assure good "chemistry."

University rewards for the activity.

Departmental support, beginner's willingness and mentor's time.

Trust, trust, trust.

The mentor must help and let go.

Willing to risk, willing to grow, willing to learn.

**Canadian**

The person being mentored must have a vision of where he or she wants to go.

You must seek him/her out. She/he is a confidant who can empathize.

Mentor and associate both must be willing participants.

Only choice! No structure!

Trust.

Friendship . . .

Friendship and professional respect.

Some form of connectedness.

Personalities must match.

Interest in other's work.

All this cloak and dagger stuff surrounding promotion and tenure has to be done away with.

Time and resources to mentor.

Opportunity. Support from administration.

Organizational accommodation of the method.

Proximity helps.

Beginning faculty member needs more than one mentor.

Generally, these respondent comments illustrate the import of colleges and universities supporting and facilitating mentoring.

## Conclusions

The Canadian and American Studies asked the following research questions. Condensed answers are recorded after each question.

1) To what extent were educational administration professors mentored as junior faculty persons?

--Sixty-four percent of Candian respondents and 68% of American respondents had no mentor; hence responses were congruent with the literature review findings.

2) To what extent, if any, did mentoring differences exist between female and male respondents?

--Eighty percent of Canadian respondents were male. Eighty-three percent of American respondents were male. Canada had slightly more female respondents (20% vs. 17%). There was gender congruence in the two countries.

--Fifty-seven percent of Canadian female respondents had mentors while only 31% of Canadian males had mentors. This is a major finding because mentoring promotes professional success and certainly enhances female chances for upward career mobility.

--Thirty-three percent of Canadian females stated that they had more than one mentor, in contrast to 16% of males. (No American data were available on this item). Again, Canadian females had the advantage of several mentors

which enabled them to draw on the perspectives of different professionals.

--Eighty-two percent of Canadian females and 66% of males believed a mentor would be helpful. (No American data available). Because far fewer males agreed, a generalization, although not proven, might suggest that females were more open to assistance than males or that more males had already attained the rank of full professor.

--Sixty-seven percent of Canadian females had mentors who were in educational administration; thirty-five percent of males had mentors who were in a general education department. This discrepancy might be explained by the fact that it has been a fairly recent occurrence that educational administration departments came unto their own. Males came out of training programs prior to the prevalence of educational administration departments; therefore, were mentored by education professors. American data not available.

--One hundred percent of Canadian females had mentors who possessed doctoral degrees; Eighty-nine percent of males had mentors with doctorates. Again, Canadian females might have had an edge over their male counterparts, by having mentors with terminal degrees. American data not available.

--Thirty-three percent of Canadian females had female mentors; only 7% of males had female mentors. Eighteen percent of American female respondents had female mentors; only 6% of American male respondents had female mentors. The scarcity of female mentors is apparent, but could change as more females enter professorial ranks.

--Of Canadian females who had mentors, 58% received two hours or less of mentoring a week; which also held true for 86% of males. Time spent mentoring per week was comparable among American respondents. Fifty-three percent of females and 71% of males received two hours or less of mentoring a week.

--One hundred percent of Canadian females indicated willingness to mentor; 86% of males stated they would mentor. Fewer American female respondents indicated willingness to mentor (95%), than males (99%).

--Sixty-seven percent of Canadian females who had a mentor strongly agreed that the mentor was very helpful to them as junior faculty; only 38% of males strongly agreed. American data, for this item, were combined rather than separating female and male. Seventeen percent of American respondents strongly agreed that a mentor was very helpful to them.

--Thirty-nine percent of Canadian females strongly agreed that mentor provided feedback on performance; only 15% of males strongly agreed. Here again American data were combined where a composite of 19% strongly agreed.

--Fifty-eight percent of Canadian females agreed that mentor taught them in's and out's of publishing; 43% of males agreed which was a substantial difference between female and male. American data not available.

--Sixty-nine percent of Canadian females agreed that mentor was a close friend; 59% of males responded that mentor was a close friend. American data not available.

--Sixty-seven percent of Canadian females agreed that they acquired a mentor by chance, while fewer males (50%) found their mentor by chance. American data not available.

--Fifty-eight percent of Canadian females agreed that a mentor helped them with professional organizations; 47% of males received this help. American data not available.

3) To what extent did advantages and disadvantages exist for proteges in mentoring? This research question was answered from an open-ended survey item. Commonly occurring responses are stated below.

| Advantages | Disadvantages |
|---|---|
| Opportunity of "bouncing" ideas off of mentor prior to trying them. | Shortage of Time. |
| Gather advice. | Lack of common interest with mentor. |
| Learn the ropes. | Jealousy between mentor and protege. |
| Avoid major pitfalls due to inexperience. | Lack of institutional support. |
| Help chances for succeed. | Competition between mentor and protege. |
| An access point for communicating questions and problems. | No reduction in teaching, researching, serving responsibilities. |
| Someone to count on. | |
| Essential for reaching one's potential. | |

## Recommendations

This paper addressed and reported data from two studies: American and Canadian. Future researchers of mentoring should consider the following areas: 1) Problems and solutions of mentoring, 2) Ethnic differences in mentoring, 3) Advantages and disadvantages for universities to formalize mentoring, 4) Advantages and disadvantages for mentors, and 5) Mentoring models that could be established by universities and colleges.

The two studies confirmed literature findings that mentoring seldomly occurred for junior educational administration professors. Even though that was true, American and Canadian respondents expressed support for such an effort. Given the large number of professors who will soon retire, it is imperative that colleges and universities take a proactive approach by establishing and promoting mentoring for junior faculty. As Haggadah (4th century) said, "I have learned much from my teachers, and from my colleagues more than my teachers, and from my students more than from all."

Bibliography

Alleman, E., & Newman, I. (1984). Interpersonal perceptions in mentoring relationships. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Andrews, I. H. (1986). The mentor and beginning teacher's differing relationship within five paradigms of teacher induction programs. In W.A. Gray and M.M. Gray (Eds.) , Mentoring: Aid to excellence in education, the family and the community, 1, 79-86.

Atcherson, E., & Jenny, J. (1983). What about mentors and women in academe? Paper presented at the 9th Annual Mid-Year Conference of the American Educational Research Association, Tempe.

Atteberry, R. D. (1986). Mentors for female university administrators: Spouses identified. In W. A. Gray and M. M. Gray (Eds.), Mentoring: Aid to excellence in career development, business and the professions, 2, 66-73.

Auster, D. (1984). Mentors and proteges: Power-dependent dyads. Sociological Inquiry, 54(2), 142-153.

Baker, C. E. (1981). Self-renewal and the life cycle: Implications for men and women in administration. Paper presented at the 35th Annual Meeting of the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Seattle.

Barnett, S. K. (1984). The mentor role: A task of generativity. Journal of Human Behavior and Learning, 1(2), 15-18.

Barnier, L. A. (1981). The study of the mentoring relationship: An analysis of its relation to career and adult development in higher education and business. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Idaho State University.

Bellflower, D. K. (1982). Developing a mentor relationship. Roeper Review, 5(2), 45-46.

Benningfield, M. ,et al. (1984). A proposal to establish demonstration schools and the identification, training and utilization of master/mentor and master teacher. A joint School District and University of Louisville Project. Paper presented at the 36th Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, San Antonio.

Berger, D., & Connelly, J. (1988). The collegial research mentor project: A model for faculty research and scholarship development. Career Planning and Adult Development Journal, 4(2), 3-8.

Blackburn, R. T., Chapman, D. W., & Cameron, S. M. (1981). "Cloning" in academe: Mentorship and academic careers. Research in Higher Education, 15(4), 315-327.

Berry, P. (1983). Mentor for women managers. Fast-track to corporate success. Supervisory Management, 28(8), 36-40.

Blackwell, J. E. (1989). Mentoring: An action strategy for increasing minority faculty. Academe, 75(5), 8-14.

Bogat, G., & Redner, R. L. (1985). How mentoring affects the professional development of women in psychology. Professional psychology: Research and practice, 16(6), 851-859.

Boston, B. O. (1976). The sorcerer's apprentice: A case study in the role of the mentor. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 126 671)

Bova, B. M., & Phillips, R. R. (1984). Mentoring as a learning experience for adults. Journal of Teacher Education, 25(3), 16-20.

Bova, B. M., & Phillips, R. H. (1982). The mentoring relationship as an educational experience. Paper presented at National Conference of the Adult Educational Association of the USA, San Antonio.

Bowen, D. D. (1985). Were men meant to mentor women? Training and Development Journal, 39(2), 31-36.

Braskkamp, L. A., et al. (1982). Faculty development and achievement: A faculty's view. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Assocation, New York.

Bridgewater, C. A. (1984). The phases of mentorship. Psychology Today, 18, 74.

Brown, R. D., & DeCoster, D. A. (1982). Mentoring-transcript systems for promoting student growth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Burack, E. H. (1984). The sphinx's riddle: Life and career cycles. Training and Development Journal, 38(4), 52-59.

Burke, R. J. (1984). Mentors in organizations. Group and Organization Studies, 9(3), 353-372.

Burke, R. J. (1982). The role of mentors and sponsors in management development. CTM: The human element, 15(2), 10-13.

Busch, J. W. (1983). An analysis of mentoring relationships in schools of education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Mexico.

Busch, J. W. (1985). Mentoring in graduate schools of education: Mentors' perceptions. American Educational Research Journal, 22(2), 257-265.

Bushardt, S. C., Moore, R. N., & Debnath, S. C. (1982). Picking the right person for your mentor. S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal, 46(3), 46-51.

Cameron, S.M. (1978). Women in academia: Faculty sponsorship informal social structures and career success. Michigan University: Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Cameron, S. W. , & Blackburn, R. T. (1981). Sponsorship and academic career success. Journal of Higher Education, 52(4), 369-377.

Carter, H. M. (1982). Making it in academia: Gurus can get you there? Boston, MA: Northeastern University, Center for Asian Studies. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 235 758)

Caruso, R., & et al. (1988). Mentoring relationships in higher education: An empirical study. Campus Activities Programming, 21(6), 50-54.

Case, C. H. (1976). Professional staff development: A community college model. Pittsburg, CA: Los Medanos College.

Castaneda, C. (1974). Tales of Power. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Chauvin, J. C. (1988). Mentoring: A powerful force in leadership development. Gifted Child Today, 11, 24-25.

Clark, S., & Corcoran, M. (1986). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty. Journal of Higher Education, 57, 20-43.

Clawson, J. G. (1980). Mentoring in managerial careers. In James G. Clawson (Ed.), Work, family and the career -- New frontiers in theory and research. New York: Praeger.

Clawson, J. G. (1985). Is mentoring necessary? Training and Development Journal, 39(4), 36-39.

Collin, A. (1986). The role of the mentor in the experience of change. W. A. Gray and M. M. Gray (Eds.), Mentoring: Aid to excellence in career development, business and the professions, 2, 64-101.

Collins, N. W. (1983). Professional women and their mentors. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Collins, R. L. (1982). Colonialism on campus: A critique of mentoring to achieve equity in higher education. Cincinnati, OH: University of Cincinnati, Foundations of Education Department. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 760)

Cook, M. F. (1979). Is the mentor relationship primarily a male experience? Personnel Administrator, 24(11), 82-84.

Cook, M. H. (1982). Mentoring -- A two way street to professional development. Training and Development Journal, 36(5), 4-5.

Crandall, H.B. (1981). Are mentors necessary for successful careers? Direct Marketing, 44(6), 124-130.

Daloz, L. A. (1983). Mentors: Teachers who make a difference. Change, 15(6), 24-27.

Dalton, G. W., Thompson, P. H., & Price, Raymond L. (1977). The four stages of professional careers -- A new look at perfomance by professionals. Organizational Dynamics, 19-42.

Daresh, J. (1987). Mentoring: A key feature of the Danforth program for the preparation of principals. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administrators, Charlottesville, VA.

Darling, L. W. (1985). The case for mentor moderation. The Journal of Nursing Administration, 15(7/8), 42-43.

Darling, L. W. (1985). Cultivating minor mentors. The Journal of Nursing Administration, 15(1), 41-42.

Darling, L. W. (1985). Endings in mentor relationships. The Journal of Nursing Administration, 15(11), 40-41.

Darling, L. W. (1985). The mentoring mosaic: A new theory of mentoring. In W. A. Gray & M. M. Gray (Eds.), Mentoring: Aid to excellence in career development, business and the professions, 2, 1-7.

Darling, L. W. (1985). Mentor matching. The Journal of Nursing

Administration, 15(1), 45-46.

Darling, L. W. (1985). Mentor types and life cycles. The Journal of Nursing Administration, 15(11), 43-44.

Darling, L. W. (1985). Self-mentoring strategies. The Journal of Nursing Administration, 15(4), 42-43.

Darling, L. W. (1985). What to do about toxic mentors. The Journal of Nursing Administration, 15(5), 43-44.

Davis, R.L., & Garrison, P.A. (1979). Mentoring: In search of a taxonomy. Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dickson, A. M. (1983). The relationship between mentorship and other variables and administrators' perceptions of the career development process in higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University.

Diehl, P. F., & Simpson, R. D. (1989). Investing in junior faculty: The teaching improvement program (TIPs). Innovative Higher Education, 13(2), 147-157.

Durrant, S. W. (1988). The myth of mentoring. ADFL Bulletin, 19(3), 42-44.

Eberspacker, J., & Sisler, G. (1988). Mentor relationships in academic administration. Initiatives, 51(4), 27-32.

Editorial Staff, California State Department of Education: California Mentor Teacher Program. (1983). California Mentor Teacher Program: Program Advisory. California State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 241 473)

Editorial Staff, Journal of Teacher Education. (1984). The socialization of beginning teachers through mentor-protege relationships. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 21-24.

Edson, A.S. (1980). Mentors -- do they work in PR? Public Relations

Journal, 36(7), 18-19.

Elwood, W. R. (1981). The necessity of the faculty mentor in the development of the artist-scholar. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Theater Association, Dallas. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 212 012)

Emrick, W. (1989). Implementing a mentoring and peer coaching program. ERS Spectrum, 7, 17-21.

Endsley, R. C., & Giles, H. W. (1988). Assessing career development relationships in academe. Career Planning and Adult Development Journal, 4(2), 22-28.

Epstein, C. F. (1970). Encountering the male establishment: Sex-status limits on women's careers in the professions. American Journal of Sociology, 75, 965-982.

Erickson, K.A., & Pitner, N.J. (1980). The mentor concept is alive and well. NASSP Bulletin, 64, 8-14.

Erkut, S., & Mokros, J. R. (1984). Professors as models and mentors for college students. American Educational Research Journal, 21(2), 399-417.

Ernst, R. (1982). Women in higher education leadership positions. Journal of the College and University Personnel Association, 2, 19-22.

Eveslage, S.A. (1987). Faculty perceptions of their career-helping relationships. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the study of higher education, Baltimore, MD. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 292 397)

Farren, C., Gary, J. D., & Kaye, B. (1984). Mentoring: A boon to career development. Personnel, 61(6), 20-24.

Fitt, L.W., & Newton, D.A. (1981). When the mentor is a man and the protegee a woman. Harvard Business Review, 59(2), 56-60.

Follon, S. E. (1983). Role models and mentors: A study of the career

patterns of women in higher education administration. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Drake University, Des Moines.

Fowler, D. L. (1980). An analysis of sex and departmental differences in the perceptions of assistant professors regarding work environments, mentoring, and academic employment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.

Fowler, D. L. (1982). Mentoring relationships and the perceived quality of the academic work environment. Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators & Counselors, 45(3), 27-33.

Frey, B. and Noller, R. (1988). Mentoring: A membership mission. Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 54, 56-62.

Friedman, M. (1983). Dialogue in mentoring and research. The Confirmation of Otherness in Family, Community and Society. New York: The Pilgrim Press, 167-175.

Funk, C. (1986). The female executive in school administration: Profiles, pluses and problems. Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Women and Work, Arlington. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 285 282)

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). Mentoring: A review of the literature with a focus on teaching. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1985). Teacher mentors: A review of the literature. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Gardner, J. N. (1981). Developing faculty as facilitators and mentors. New Directions for Student Services, 14, 67-80.

Gehrke, N. (1988). Toward a definition of mentoring. Theory into Practice, 27(3), 190-194.

Gehrke, N. J., & Kay, R. S. (1984). The socialization of beginning teachers

through mentor-protege relationships. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 21-24.

George, P., & Kummerow, J. (1981). Mentoring for career women. Training, 18(2), 44-49.

Gerstein, M. (1985). Mentoring: An old age practice in a knowledge based society. Journal of Counseling and Development, 65(2), 156-157.

Gilbert, L. A. (1985). Dimensions of same-gender student-faculty role-model relationships. Sex Roles, 12(1-2), 111-123.

Gillespie, P. (1982). What every woman needs. Association for Communication Administration, 42, 44-46.

Gold, M. and Pepin, B. (1987). Passing the torch: Retired teachers as mentors for new teachers (Report No. Case 05-87). New York, NY: City University of New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 286 863)

Goldberg, J. H., & Laurin, M. A. (1984). Teaching new dogs old tricks. Paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Association, Chicago.

Grant, C. A., & Zeichner, K. M. (1981). Inservice support for first year teachers: The state of the scene. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 14(2), 99-111.

Gray, M. M. (1984). Looking ahead: Perspective-taking by mentors. Paper presented at the 23rd International Congress of Psychology, Acapluco.

Gray, W. A. (1986). Components for developing a successful formalized mentoring program in business, the professions, and other settings. In W. A. Gray & M. M. Gray (Eds.), Mentoring: Aid to excellence in career development, business and the professions, 2, 15-22.

Gray, W.A. (1985). A helping relationship model for enabling mentors to

work successfully with proteges: Guidelines and benefits. In F. L. Denmark (Ed.), Social/Ecological Psychology and the Psychology of Women, 8, 237-254.

Gray, W. A., & Gray, M. M. (1985). Synthesis of research on mentoring beginning teachers. Educational Leadership, 43(3), 37-43.

Halatin, T.J. (1981). Why be a mentor? Supervisory Management, 26, 36-39.

Halatin, T. J., & Knotts, R. E. (1982). Becoming a mentor: Are the risks worth the rewards? Supervisory Management, 27(2), 27-29.

Hall, R., & Sandler, B. (1983). Academic mentoring for women students and facutly: A new look at an old way to get ahead. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Hamlin, K., & Hering, K. (1988). Help for the first-year teacher, buddy, or both? NASSP Bulletin, 72, 125-127.

Harris, G. T. (1980). Godfathers and gossips. Industry Week, 207(2), 32-37.

Henning, M. and Jardin, A. (1976). The managerial woman. New York: Doubleday.

Herrington, C., & and Harney, L. (1985). Mentorship and women. Hiver (winter), 12-13.

Hertherington, C., & Barcelo, R. (1985). Womentoring: A cross-cultural perspective. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 49, 12-15.

Hill, S. E. K., et al. (1989). The impact of mentoring and collegial support on faculty success: An analysis of support behavior, information adequacy, and communication apprehension. Communication Education, 38(1), 15-33.

Hill, S.E.K. (1989). Mentoring and other communication support in

the academic setting. Group and Organizational Studies, 14(3), 355-368.

Holmes, S. K. (1988). New faculty mentoring: Benefits to the mentor. Journal of Staff Program, & Organization Development, 6, 17-20.

Holt, M. E. (1981). Strategies for the "ascent of woman" in higher education administration in the 80s. Journal of NAWDAC, 44(3), 21-24.

Howey, K. R. (1988). Mentor-teachers as inquiring professionals. Educational Digest, 54, 19-22.

Hunt, D. M. (1986). Formal vs. informal mentoring: Towards a framework. In W. A. Gray and M. M. Gray (Eds.), Mentoring: Aid to excellence in career development, business and the professions, 2, 8-14.

Hunt, D.M., & Michael, C. (1983). Mentorship: A career training and development tool. Academy of Management Review, 8(3), 475-485.

Hunter, D.E. (1985). What prolific higher education scholars have to say about their careers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Chicago.

Irvine, J. J. (1986). The master teacher as mentor: Role perceptions on beginning and master teachers. Education, 106(2), 123-130.

Johnson, M. C. (1980). Mentors--the key to development and growth. Training and Development Journal, 34(7), 55-57.

Johnston, J., & James, T. (1986). Leadership and cooperation through mentoring: Rethinking roles in teacher education. Paper presented at the Association of Teacher Education, Flagstaff. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 649)

Josefowitz, N. (1980). Paths to Power. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Kaminski, V. (1981). Developing political savvy. Supervisory Management, 26(9), 36-39.

Kaplan, G. (1985). Coming up with bright ideas: Women in academia. Vestes, 28, 19-22.

Keele, R., & De La Mare-Schafer, M. (1984). So what do you do now that you don't have a mentor? Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 47, 36-40.

King, R. (1986). Women mentors as leaders. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Klauss, R. (1981). Mentors and senior advisors for executive development. United States Office of Personnel Management, Executive Personnel and Management Development, Washington, D.C.

Klopf, G J., & Harrison, Joan. (1981). Moving up the career ladder: The case for mentors. Principal, 61(1), 41-43.

Knox, P. L. and McGovern, T. V. (1988). Mentoring in academia. Teaching of Psychology, 15(1), 39-41.

Kram, K. E. (1985). Improving the mentoring process. Training and Development Journal, 39(4), 40-43.

Kram, K. E., & Isabella, L. A. (1985). Mentoring alternatives: The role of peer relationships in career development. Academy of Management Journal, 28(1), 110-132.

Kram, K. E. (1985). Mentoring at work: Developmental relationships in organizational life. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Kram, K., & Isabella, L. A. (1983). Much ado about mentors, not enough about peers. The Career Development Bulletin, 3(4), 14-15.

Lambert, D., & Lambert, L. (1985). Mentor teachers as change

facilitators. Thrust, 28-32.

Lean, E. (1983). Cross-gender mentoring: Downright upright and good for productivity. Training and Development Journal, 37(5), 61-65.

LeCroy, R. (1984). Women mentors as leaders. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Levine, S. (1987). Peer support for women in middle management. Educational Leadership, 45, 74-75.

Levinson, D. J. (1978). Growing up with a dream. Psychology Today, 12(11), 20-34.

Levinson, H. (1979). Mentoring: Socialization for leadership. Paper presented at the 1979 Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Atlanta.

Little, J. W., Falagaran, P., & O'Neil, R. (1984). Professional development roles and relationships: Principles and skills of "advising". Far West Laboratory For Educational Research and Development, San Francisco.

Loden, M. (1985). Feminine Leadership. New York: Times Book.

Marsicarno, H. E. (1981). Role of mentors in developing careers: Do women need mentors? Paper presented at the West Virginia University Council on Women's Concerns. Morgantown.

McNear, E. (1983). Two opportunities for mentoring: A study of women's career development in higher education administration. National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 47, 8-14.

Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and proteges: A critical review of the literature. Adult Education Quarterly, 33(3), 161-173.

Merriam, S., et al. (1987). Mentoring in higher education: What we

know now. Review of Higher Education, 11, 199-210.

Mertz, N. (1987). Why women aren't mentored. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Portland.

Miller, J. (1976). Toward a new psychology of women. Boston, Beacon Press.

Miller, L. M. (1989). Mentorships and the perceived educational payoffs. Phi Delta Kappan, 70(6), 465-467.

Missirian, A. K. (1982). The corporate connection: Why executive women need mentors to reach the top. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Mooney, C. J. (1989). Professors' career patterns. Chronicle of Higher Education, 35(22), 11-13.

Moore, K. M. (1982). The role of mentors in developing leaders for academe. Educational Record, 63(1), 23-28.

Moore, K. M., & Salimbene, A. M. (1981). The dynamics of the mentor-protege relationship in developing women as academic leaders. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 2, 51-64.

Moore, R. W. (1986). Winning the Ph.D. game. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

Morris, D. (1987). Innovation: The changing perception of leadership. Performance and Instruction, 26, 20-24.

Natale, S. M. (1982). Women in the "Old Boy Network". Thrust: The Journal for Employment and Professionals, 4(1), 25-33.

Nichols, I. A., & Golden, M. P. (1982). The middle way: Patron as guide. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, New York.

Noller, R. B. (1982). Mentoring: A voice scarf--an experience in

creative problem solving. Buffalo, NY: Bearly Limited.

O'Neil, J. H. (1981). Toward a theory and practice of mentoring in psychology. In J. H. O'Neil & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.); Mentoring: Psychological, personal and career implications. Symposium presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Pyschological Association.

Pascale, R. T., & Athos, A. G. (1981). The art of Japanese management. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1983). Establishing a formalized mentoring program. Training and Development Journal, 37(2), 40-42.

Pilette, P.C. (1980). Mentoring: An encounter of the leadership kind. Nursing Leadership, 3(2), 22-26.

Queralt, M. (1982). The role of the mentor in the career development of university faculty members and academic administrators. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 216 614)

Rawlins, M., & Rawlins, L. (1983). Mentoring and networking for helping professionals. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62(2), 116-118.

Reich, M. H. (1986). The mentor connection. Personnel, 63(2), 50-56.

Reohr, J. R. (1981). Mentor and colleague relationships in academia. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Studies Association, Boston.

Rooke, P. (1989). Re-ordering out partiality: reflections on careerism and feminist commitment in academia. Journal of Educational Thought, 23(2), 106-119.

Rowe, M. P. (1981). Building mentorship frameworks as part of an effective equal opportunity ecology. J. Farley (Ed.), Sex discrimination in higher education, Ithaca, NY. 23-33; 102-104.

Sacks, S. R., & Wilcox, K. K. (1986). From master teacher to mentor. Mentor/new teacher project. In W. A. Gray & M. M. Gray (Eds.), Mentoring: Aid to excellence in education, the family and the community, 1, 116-123.

Sample, J. A. (1984). Exploring management development roles for educational adminsitrators: Coach, mentor and sponsor. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 584)

Schein, E. H. (1978). Career dynamics: Matching individual and organizational needs. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Schmidt, J. A. and Wolfe, J. S. (1980). The mentor partnership: Discovery of professionalism. NASSP Journal, 17(3), 45-51.

Schneider, C., et al. (1983). The balancing act: Competencies of effective teachers and mentors. Innovation Abstracts, 5(4).

Schockett, M. R., & Haring-Hidore, M. (1985). Factor analytic support for psychosocial and vocational functions. Psychological Reports, 57, 627-630.

Scollay, S. J. (1988). "Mentoring/sponsorship" relationships in higher education administrative careers: An exploratory investigation. Paper read at American Educational Research Association-Division J, New Orleans.

Seal, A. (1984). The mentoring process in business and academia: The mentor's perspective (apprenticeship, sponsor, protege). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.

Serlen, B. (1989). How mentoring programs work. Journal of Career Planning Employment, 49, 54-56.

Severance, D. W. (1982). Active humanistic behavior in social and therapeutic interaction. Paper presented at the 90th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 230 835)

Seymour, J. C. (1985). CAPS-Presceptors: Serving all the students.

(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 257 491)

Shapiro, E. C., Haseltine, F. P., & Rowe, M. P. (1978). Moving up: Role models, mentors, and the "patron system". Sloan Management Review, 19(3), 51-58.

Short, B., & Seeger, M. (1984). Mentoring and organizational communication: A review of the research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Central States Speech Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 245 282)

Short, P.M. (1989). Women professors of educational administration: A profile and salient issues. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Shulman, J., et al. (1984). Expanded teacher roles: Mentors and masters. San Francisco, CA: Technical Report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 118)

Simeone, A. (1987). Academic women workng towards equality. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Farley.

Simpson, N. (1984). The mentor-protege relationship in professional psychology: A survey of faculty and student attitudes. Paper presented at the 30th Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans.

Smith, C. (1982). Black female achievers in academe. Journal of Negro Education, 51, 318-341.

Spruell, G. H. (1985). Love in the office. Training and Development Journal, 39(2), 20-23.

Stein, S. (1981). Faculty expectations of doctoral and career mentors. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 788)

Stuller, J. (1983). Should you be a mentor? Success, 30(5), 21-23.

Sublette, B. (1983). The exlusive mentor. University of Alumni News, 71(6), 7-8.

Swoboda, M., & Millar, S. (1986). Networking mentoring: Career strategy of women in academic administration. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 50, 8-13.

Taylor, R.G., & Card, R. (1988). Collegiality and independence: Faculty collaboration in higher education. Department Advisor, 4, 6-10.

Taylor, S. (1986). Mentors: Who are they and what are they doing? Thrust for Educational Leadership, 15, 39-41.

Thompson, J. (1976). Patrons, rabbis, mentors--whatever you call them, women need them, too. MBA (Master in Business Administration), 10(2), 27-30.

Torrance, E.P. (1984). Mentoring relationships: How they aid creative achievement, endure change, and die. Buffalo, NY: Bearly Limited.

Touchton, J., & Shavlick, D. (1978). Challenging the assumptions of leadership: Women and men of the academy. New Directions for Higher Education, 6(2), 95-106.

Uhlir, G.A. (1989). Leadership and gender. Academe, 75, 28-32.

Vance, C. N. (1982). The mentor connection. The Journal of Nursing Administration, 12(4), 7-13.

Vertz, L. L. (1985). Women, occupational advancement, and mentoring: An analysis of one public organization. Public Administration Forum, 45(3), 415-423.

Vidoni, D.O., et al. (1988). The mentor-protege relationship in a university setting. College Studies, 22, 404-407.

Wagner, L. A. (1985). Evaluation issues in California's mentor teacher

program: Where can we go from here? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Walter, L. M. (1982). Lifeline to the underprepared: Successful academic advising. Improving the College and University Teaching, 30(4), 159-163.

Watkins, B. (1980). Training educational opportunity researchers: Some sobered thoughts on mentoring. Some optimistic thoughts on community. Paper presented at the 64th Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 193 322)

Weiner, Andrew. (1984). The mentor syndrome. Quest.

Williams, R., & Blackburn, R.T. (1988). Mentoring and junior faculty productivity. Journal of Nursing Education, 27, 204-209.

Willis, H., & Dodgson, J. (1984). Mentoring the Canadian women in educational administration (summary). Paper presented at the 26th Annual Conference of the Ontario Educational Research Council.

Winstone, C. L. (1986). Personal transformation of the protege: The mentoring relationship as a context. In W. A. Gray & M. M. Gray (Eds.), Mentoring: Aid to excellence in career development, business, and the professions, 2, 81-93.

Woodlands Group. (1980). Management development roles: Coach, sponsor and mentor. Personnel Journal, 59(11), 918-921.

Wrightsman, L. S. (1981). Research methodologies for assessing mentoring. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 209 339)

Wyley, N. R. (1988). Helping new faculty adjust to careers at liberal art colleges. Report by the Great Lakes Colleges Association, Ann Arbor.

Xu, M., & Newman, D. (1987). Mentoring new faculty in higher education

setting. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Evaluation Association, Boston.

Yoder, J. D. (1980). Queen bees or tokens: Person and situation-centered approaches to mentors. St. Louis, MO: Webster College.

Yoder, J. (1984). Surviving the transition from graduate student to assistant professor. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 249 867)

Young, C., MacKenzie, D., & Sherif, C. (1980). In search of token women in academia. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 4, 508-525.

Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? Harvard Business Review, 55(3), 67-78.

Zehme, B. (1983). Mentoring as corporate strategy. Success, 30(5), 23.

Zey, M. G. (1985). Mentor programs: Making the right moves. Personnel Journal, 64(2), 53-57.

Zey, M. (1984). The mentor connection. Illinois: Dow Jones-Irwin.

Zey, M. G. (1986). Only the beginning: Five major trends that signal the growth of corporate formal mentor programs. In W. A. Gray & M. M. Gray (Eds.), Mentoring: Aid to excellence in career development, business and the professions, 2, 153-160.

Zimpher, N. L. (1988). Mentoring teachers. Theory Practice, 27, 174-236.